

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

DANNY JOHNSTON,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff / Counter-Defendant,	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
PATRICIA ANN JOHNSTON,	§	
	§	Case No. 6:23-cv-413-JDK
Defendant / Counter-Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
EAST TEXAS OIL FIELD	§	
CONSTRUCTION, LLC,	§	
	§	
Counter-Defendant.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court is Counter-Plaintiff Patricia Johnston's Motion for Default Judgment as to East Texas Oil Field Construction, LLC. Docket No. 40. This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.


On April 19, 2024, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the Court deny the motion for default judgment without prejudice. Docket No. 42. Judge Mitchell further recommended that Patricia Johnston be granted leave to file an amended counterclaim that adequately alleges diversity jurisdiction. No written objections have been filed. On April 26, 2024, Patricia Johnston moved for leave to file an amended counterclaim. Docket No. 46.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, no objections were filed. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 42) as the findings of this Court and **DENIES** Counter-Plaintiff Patricia Johnston’s motion for default judgment without prejudice (Docket No. 40).

**So ordered and signed on this**  
May 8, 2024

  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE